

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	<del></del>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/706,472	11/10/2003	Thomas James Batzinger	RD-28,303-1	6737	
*****	7590 03/01/200 ECTRIC COMPANY	EXAMINER			
GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59			SMITH, NIC	SMITH, NICHOLAS A	
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309		77.607	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1742		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/01/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action					
Before	the F	iling	of an	Appeal	Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/706,472 BATZINGER ET AL.		BATZINGER ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Nicholas A. Smith	1742		

	Nicholas A. Smith	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, affice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE D6.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying	/
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)</li> </ul>	: lowable if submitted in a separate,  ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	vided below or appended.		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	intry is below or attac	ned.
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to Applicant's argument that Li (US Patent 6,355,156) does not anticipate claim 1 limitation of synchronizing by delaying the excitation of the ultrasonic sensor a dewll time Td after a reduction of the potential difference, Examiner reminds Applicant that turning the power supply off (or more specifically, zero potential during pulsed electrochemical machining, i.e. off-times) does meet the limitaiton of a reduciton of the potential difference. In regards to Applicant's argument that Klocke et al. (US 2003/0079989) does not teach claim 4 limitation of limiting the dwell time to about 7 ms to about 15 ms, Examiner reminds Applicant that Li teaches excitation of the ultrasnoic sensor after bubbles have cleared the surface of the workpiece. Klocke et al. further teaches that bubble minization is a results effective variable in electrochemical processes. While bubble reduction is not the calimed paramater in instant claims 4-7, one of ordinary skill would realize that dwell time is directly related to bubble minimization, in that, the longer the electrode is not nergized, the more time there is for impinging flow to clear the electrode surface of bubbles to allow an accurate measurement. In regards to Applicant's argument that Li does not teach the claim 9 limitation of two ultrasonic sensors make measurements on both sides of an airfoil and including an offset time between ultrasonic sensor signal excitation, Exmainer reminds Applicant that while Li et al. only specifically discloses one ultrasonic sensor to monitor the gap distance of one side of an airfoil in an electrochemical machining process (abstract, Figure 1), Li et al. does disclose two sides of an airfoil to be electrochemically machined (Figures 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Li et al.'s electrochemical machining process to employ a second ultrasonic sensor on the second side of an airfoil in order monitor the gap distance of the second side of an airfoil (Li et al., abstract). Furthermore, with such a modification, Li et al. Would teach exciting a firstultrasonic sensor to direct an ultrasonic wave towards a surface of one of the electrodes and exciting a second ultrasonic sensor to direct an ultrasonic wave toward a surface of another of the electrodes. Furthermore, including an offset time between ultrasonic sensor signal excitation is a necessary adjustment inherent to a control system employing multiple emitting/receiving sensors in order to avoid attenuation or interference.

ROA KING

SUPERVISORY PATERT FYRANCES